

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

TYROSH BROWN,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:09-cv-740

v

HON. JANET T. NEFF

MICHIGAN WORKS, et al.,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff filed this civil rights action pro se, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendant Michigan Works filed a motion to dismiss, arguing that (1) Michigan Works is not a proper party to the litigation because it is simply a trademark, and (2) Michigan Works did not provide any services to Plaintiff (Dkt 13). Plaintiff did not file any opposition to Defendant's motion. The matter was referred to the Magistrate Judge, who issued a Report and Recommendation, recommending that Defendant's motion be granted (Dkt 15). The matter is presently before the Court on Plaintiff's objections (Dkt 16) to the Report and Recommendation.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3), the Court has performed de novo review of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections have been made. The Court denies Plaintiff's objections and issues this Opinion.

Plaintiff objects to the Magistrate Judge's conclusion that Plaintiff's complaint should be dismissed as to Defendant Michigan Works (Dkt 16 at 1). Plaintiff's objection is without merit.

Plaintiff merely indicates his disagreement with the Magistrate Judge's conclusion. However, Plaintiff's objection does not reveal any error by the Magistrate Judge in her factual or legal analysis.

An Order of Dismissal will be entered consistent with this Opinion.

For these reasons and because this action was filed *in forma pauperis*, this Court also certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal of this Order would not be taken in good faith.

See McGore v. Wrigglesworth, 114 F.3d 601, 610 (6th Cir. 1997).

Dated: March 31, 2010

/s/Janet T. Neff

JANET T. NEFF

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE